

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/643,366	08/19/2003	Glennis J. Orloff	6579-69-1	4828
<sup>49698</sup> MICHAUD-DI			EXAM	INER
		CHOI, STEPHEN		
	N, CT 06457		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
		•	3724	
•				
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
		•	09/10/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary		10/643,366	ORLOFF, GLENNIS J.
		Examiner	Art Unit
		Stephen Choi	3724
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app	ears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address
A SHOWHIC - External after - If NO - Failu Any r	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA asions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. It period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period were to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tir will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. mely filed the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status			
2a) <u></u>	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>18-Ju</u> This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) This Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final.  nce except for formal matters, pro	·
Dispositi	on of Claims		
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□ 8)□ Applicati	Claim(s) 1,3-9 and 11-41 is/are pending in the 4a) Of the above claim(s) 4-9 and 11-41 is/are Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 1 and 3 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or on Papers The specification is objected to by the Examine The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acceptable.	withdrawn from consideration. r election requirement.	Examiner.
11)	Applicant may not request that any objection to the expension Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct. The oath or declaration is objected to by the Expension Replacement of the E	ion is required if the drawing(s) is ob	pjected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119	•	
, a)[	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign  All b) Some * c) None of:  Certified copies of the priority documents  Certified copies of the priority documents  Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents  application from the International Bureau  See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Applicat rity documents have been receive u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ion No ed in this National Stage
			•
2) Notice 3) Information	t(s) e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:	eate

Art Unit: 3724

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

# Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on July 18, 2007 has been entered.

#### Response to Amendment

2. Applicant's remarks filed July 18, 2007 states that claim 10 has been cancelled. However, amendment section shows claim 10 to be pending. It is assumed that claim 10 has been cancelled for this office action only. Applicant's confirmation is requested in response to this office action.

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 4. Claims 1 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Orloff (US 6,009,623) in view of Lebouitz et al. (US 6,494,882).

Orloff discloses the invention substantially as claimed except for the nonpiezoelectric sensor including at least one of an electromagnetic induction sensor, an Art Unit: 3724

ultrasonic sensor, a hall effect sensor, a capacitive sensor, a charge transfer sensor, an electric field sensor, a magnetostrictive sensor, and an angular rate sensor. Lebouitz discloses a non-piezoelectric sensor including at least one of an electromagnetic induction sensor, an ultrasonic sensor, a hall effect sensor, a capacitive sensor, a charge transfer sensor, an electric field sensor, a magnetostrictive sensor, and an angular rate sensor (e.g., 30) for use with a cutting instrument. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ a non-piezoelectric sensor as taught by Lebouitz on the device of Orloff in order to allow measurement of parameters of a blade and/or the workpiece to aid in the quality of the shave.

# Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed July 18, 2007 have been fully considered but they are 5. not persuasive.

Applicant contends that the teachings of the '882 patent would lead one of skill in the art away from moving the sensors from the cutting edge to the handle and arriving at the invention.

The examiner respectfully disagrees. Or loff teaches a sensor within a razor handle. Lebouitz teaches the use of non-piezoelectric sensor on a cutting instrument. It is the examiner's position that one skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the non-piezoelectric sensor as taught by Lebouitz in the razor handle of the Orloff to arrive at the claimed invention and that there would have been a reasonable expectation of success.

#### Conclusion

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Stephen Choi whose telephone number is 571-272-4504. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 9:00-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Boyer D. Ashley can be reached on 571-272-4502. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Stephen Choi/ Primary Examiner, AU 3724 2 September 2007